Remarks

The above Amendments, these Remarks, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), and an Information Disclosure Statement are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 17, 2007.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1 and 17-48 were pending in the Application. The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 17-48.

Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for antecedent basis reasons for reciting "the MBean information structure."

Claims 1, 17-28, 34-39, 43-44, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Viswanath (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827, priority date July 25, 2002).

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827) in view of US 5,212,784 to Sparks.

Claims 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Viswanath (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827) in view of official notice.

Claims 40-42 and 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Viswanath (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827) in view of US 6,788,980 to Johnson.

II.   Summary of Applicant's Response

The present Reply cancels claims 17 and 36, and amends claim 1 and 37-44, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 18-35, and 37-48. An Information Disclosure Statement is attached. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III.   Information Disclosure Statement

Attached is an Information Disclosure Statement containing the Java Management Extensions Instrumentation and Agent Specification, v1.2, dated October, 2002.

IV.   Related Case 10/823,290 was Allowed

Related Case 10/823,290 was allowed. A Terminal Disclaimer between this application and 10/823,290 was filed with the previous response in this case on August 3, 2007. The Viswanath reference (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827) cited in this case was cited in the related case. The Examiner's reasons for allowance in the related case stated that the "prior art of record does not render obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the applicant's invention nor anticipate the combination of claimed elements."

V.   Response to Rejections

Independent Claim 1

The features of claims 17 and 36 were moved into Independent Claim 1. Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A computer-readable medium containing instructions stored thereon, wherein the instructions comprise:

receiving an MBean definition file in XML format;

generating an MBean jar file from the MBean definition file, wherein the MBean jar file includes a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean;

placing the jar file in a predetermined directory within a managed server in a

- 9 -

management domain, wherein the management domain is a collection of distributed

servers that are managed as a unit; and

        providing a custom management capability through the MBean over the management

domain;

        wherein scope of an MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available, and

an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean's scope; and

        wherein an administration server contains a copy of all sharable MBeans

located in the management domain.

        Claim 1 defines a computer-readable medium for generating a custom MBean, including

generating an MBean jar file which includes a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute,

operation, potential notification issued by the MBean, and providing a custom management

capability through the MBean over the management domain.

        Claim 1 (previously in claim 17) requires "wherein the management domain is a collection of

distributed servers that are managed as a unit." The Office Action asserted that the table in col. 10

of Viswanath anticipated this feature. However, that particular table describes a meta-information

file describing application configuration information. Viswanath does not disclose or suggest a

management domain that "is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit."

        Claim 1 (previously in claim 36) requires that the "scope of an MBean is a set of locations at

which the MBean is available, and an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean's

scope; and wherein an administration server contains a copy of all sharable MBeans located in the

management domain." The Office Action cited col. 2, lines 37-40, which simply noted that

"components may be deployed on different servers in a network" and Fig. 3, which showed

- 10 -

Generated managed beans 212. The person skilled in the art would not accept the cited portions of Viswanath as disclosing the requirements of Claim 1. Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest scope of a MBean or sharable MBeans.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Viswanath. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Claim 21 requires "wherein the custom management capability is customized by a user by adding schema attributes and extended persistence features." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 12, "Configuration API 222 functionality may include, but is limited to, one or more of, basic configuration operations (e.g. get and set elements and attributes APIs), event notification, cloning, bean lookup mechanism (e.g. XPath) support, change management (e.g. add, update, delete, set) …" disclosed these features. However, the cited portions of Viswanath do not teach or suggest that "the custom management capability is customized by a user by adding schema attributes and extended persistence features."

Claim 22

Claim 22 requires "wherein the custom management capability is packaged as a framework with multiple MBeans which a security provider can extend." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 5, line 55, "dynamic administration framework" disclosed these features. While the cited portion of Viswanath does recite the word "framework," Viswanath does not teach or suggestion that Viswanath's framework is packaged with multiple MBeans which a security

- 11 -

provider can extend.

Claim 23

Claim 23 requires, "wherein a MBean is accessed through a type MBean stub." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "a MBean is accessed through a type MBean stub."

Claim 24

Claim 24 requires, "wherein an MBean stub provides a reference to a java object which implements an interface specific to the MBean." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "an MBean stub provides a reference to a java object which implements an interface specific to the MBean."

Claim 25

Claim 25 requires, "wherein stubs are generated dynamically at runtime." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "wherein stubs are generated dynamically at runtime."

- 12 -

Claim 34

Claim 34 requires "wherein a local MBean server handles read attribute requests and MBean creation and deletion requests for server specific MBeans." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 17, lines 36-39 "API 222 may provide a generic interface to manage (e.g. create, read... write and/or delete) ... the generated configuration beas 210") disclosed these features. However, the cited portion of Viswanath describes a configuration API, it does not describe "a local MBean server handles read attribute requests and MBean creation and deletion requests for server specific MBeans." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to disclose or suggest "server specific MBeans."

Claim 35

Claim 35 requires "wherein an MBean Server Proxy routes read access to an appropriate server and MBean instance within the appropriate server and routes write accesses to the corresponding MBean instance on the administration server." The Office Action cited Viswanath Fig. 1A, Web Server 104 and Application Server 108A-B as disclosing these features. However, Fig. 1A describes a Web Server and an Application Server, it does not disclose "wherein an MBean Server Proxy routes read access to an appropriate server and MBean instance within the appropriate server and routes write accesses to the corresponding MBean instance on the administration server." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to disclose or suggest an MBean Server Proxy routing read access to a server with a MBean and write access to an administration server with a corresponding MBean instance."

- 13 -

Claim 37

Claim 37 requires that "changes to an MBean are propagated from an administration server to all servers within the scope of the MBean." The Office Action cited Viswanath col. 16, lines 4-18, which stated (on lines 15-18): "the changes may be serialized and sent to one or more other application servers that have a global configuration context in memory and that have registered listeners." The cited portion of Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest "servers within the scope of the MBean."

Claim 38

Claim 38 requires that "applications and servers must go to a particular server to read a server-specific MBean." The Office Action cited Viswanath, col. 15, lines 17-18, "In one embodiment, user applications may not be deployed to an administration server." However, this cited portion of Viswanath simply states that in one embodiment the administration server and the application server are different servers. The cited portion of Viswanath does not teach or suggest that "applications and servers must go to a particular server to read a server-specific MBean." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest server-specific MBeans.

Claims 40-42

Claim 40 requires "wherein the scope is specified in the MBean definition file." The Office Action conceded that Viswanath does not disclose scope. However, the Office Action asserted that Johnson (U.S. patent no. 6,788,980) col. 23, lines 17-18, "supports the implementation of naming scopes, i.e. limiting the visibility of names" could be combined with Viswanath to reject Claim 40 under 35. U.S.C. 103(a). However, Johnson's use of naming scopes can not be combined with

Viswanath to reject Claim 40. Claim 1 defined scope by stating that "scope of an MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available, and an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean's scope. Johnson's definition of scope does not meet the requirements of Claim 1, therefore Johnson and Viswanath cannot be combined to create a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

Claims 41-42 were similarly subject to an improper 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

Claim 43

Claim 43 (as amended) requires, "wherein a request for a server specific MBean can ~~may~~ be handled by any MBean server in the management domain." The Office Action cited Viswanath col. 16, lines 53-57, "the generated administration framework may provide a unified view and access (via the configuration API) to administration information (persistent store 204) that may be distributed across multiple locations and multiple storages" as disclosing these features. The person of skill in the art would not believe that the cited portion of Viswanath teaches or suggests that "a request for a server specific MBean can ~~may~~ be handled by any MBean server in the management domain."

Claim 45

Claim 45 requires "wherein when a request is received for an MBean not available on a MBean server, the MBean server calls a method that returns a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain." The Office Action conceded that Viswanath did not disclose these features, but asserted that Johnson col. 23, lines 17-18, "rule based specification of the name delimiting character; locates an object based on a longest fit because not all parts of an object name are globally known" could be combined with Viswanath's col. 19, lines

- 15 -

20-23 "a query mechanism" to disclose these features. The cited portion of Johnson describes Object Location Services. The cited portion does not however describe "wherein when a request is received for an MBean not available on a MBean server, the MBean server calls a method that returns a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain."

Dependent Claims 18-35 and 37-48

Dependent Claims 18-35 and 37-48 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, dependent Claims 18-35 and 37-48 are patentable.

VI.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2008   By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
                                               Thomas K. Plunkett
                                               Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 16 -